



PADUCAH GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

111 Memorial Drive • Paducah, Kentucky 42001 • (270) 554-3004 • padssab@apex.net • www.oakridge.doe.gov/pgdpssab

Chair

Mark Donham

Board Members

Nola Courtney

Judy Duff

Judy Ingram

Vicki Jones

Becky Lambert

Merryman Kemp

Ronald Lamb

Linda Long

Leon Owens

Douglas Raper

Craig Rhodes

John Russell, Ph.D.

Rosa Scott

Jim Smart, Ph.D.

Bill Tanner

John Tillson

Rev. Gregory Waldrop

Deputy Designated

Federal Official

W. Don Seaborg, DOE

Ex-officio member

Ex Officio Members

Carl Froede, Jr.

Environmental Protection Agency

Jim Lane, Jr.

Fish and Wildlife Resources
(Kentucky)

Tuss Taylor

Division of Waste Management
(Kentucky)

John A. Volpe, Ph.D.

Radiation Control Branch
(Kentucky)

DOE Federal Coordinator

Patricia J. Halsey

Site Specific Advisory Board Meeting Minutes April 19, 2001

The April 19, 2001, Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting was held at the Information Age Park Resource Center in Paducah, Kentucky, at 5:30 p.m.

The following **board members** were present: Kit Atkinson, Nola Courtney, Mark Donham, Judy Ingram, Vicki Jones, Merryman Kemp, Ronnie Lamb, Linda Long, Leon Owens, Craig Rhodes, Doug Raper, Rosa Scott, Jim Smart, Bill Tanner, John Tillson and Greg Waldrop.

***Ex Officio* members** present were: Carl Froede, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Don Seaborg, Department of Energy (DOE). Gaye Brewer was present for Kentucky Division of Waste Management (KDWM).

The **DOE federal coordinator** present was Pat Halsey.

DOE- related employees present were: Dave Amick, Raul Castaneda, Marrisa Colburn, Greg Cook, Laura Crane, Gordon Dover, Todd Hendricks, Michael Higgins, Jill Holder, Craig Jones, Steve Kay, Tim Kreher, Janet Miller, Eric Morti, Todd Mullins, Walter Perry, Shirley Speer, Tom Wheeler, and Stacey Young. **Public:** Kristi Hanson and Al Puckett.

Additional information about contacting board members directly can be obtained from the CAB web site or by contacting the board at (270) 554-3004.

Agenda

Donham opened the meeting at 6 p.m. and asked for introductions. He then turned the meeting over to Kay to facilitate. Kay asked if there were proposed modifications to the tentative agenda. The discussion of recommendations and update presentation of the North/South Diversion Ditch were combined and moved to be the last presentation. Halsey asked for time for forming task forces to be added to Administrative Issues. **The modified agenda was approved by consensus.**

Minutes

The March minutes were approved by consensus.

Site Manager's Comments

Seaborg's comments included:

- Status of Building C-410. He said workers were trying to get back in the building quickly.
- DOJ has asked for another extension to decide whether to join the *qui tam* lawsuit.
- President Bush's proposed budget was issued. He noted the handout and the website where specifics of the budget could be reviewed.
- DOE and Bechtel Jacob's management had met and established four priorities.
 1. To establish a self-assessment period within the next 18 months.
 2. To establish DOE and Bechtel Jacobs as a high performance team in making the best use of money.
 3. To get the C-746-U Landfill back into functional service by August.
 4. To develop, establish, and maintain an effective relationship with the regulators from Frankfort and EPA.
- November 8-10, 2001 is the tentative date of a groundwater workshop to be held in Augusta, Georgia. Savannah River will host meeting. More information will be provided to Board as it develops. Halsey added that this workshop would be a good time for interaction with other Board groups regarding how they handle groundwater issues.
- Core team minutes would be issued soon. He said the fact sheet in the packet was helpful regarding the Core team.
- The Scrap Metal EE/CA public meeting will be April 24. He noted the public comment period for the document was April 6 through May 21.
- ATSDR has tentatively set an information meeting for May 1.
- Possibility of relocating the SSAB office and the Environmental Information Center. Seaborg said he recognized the Board needs more space, but no centrally located federal property was available. Relocation and centralization would provide the Board easier access to information. The proposed site is on Memorial Drive near Paducah Community College. The property owner would build out the space as needed to accommodate the combined facility. The response from the Board was positive.
- Action items from the March meeting. He said the information regarding the proposed CERCLA cell at Hanford should be forthcoming.

Questions regarding Site Manager's comments

Donham asked if water was still in the basement in C-410 and if it could be put through the drain. Seaborg said the analysis results did not allow the water to be put in the drain but it may be possible to treat it. Seaborg said first they had to get back in the building and deal with the criticality issues before the path forward for the water can be decided.

Hanson asked if the landowners had been contacted regarding the plutonium contamination. Seaborg said DOE was finishing data quality review of maps. Hanson then asked if further testing had been done. He said generally, no. Some landowners have requested samples since October and they have been done. Of interest, Seaborg mentioned that USEC still conducts routine vegetation sampling. DOE has not sampled vegetation since the split in 1994.

Donham commented on the Chairs Conference call that Secretary Abraham has sent a letter to the governors of the states with major sites. He asked that the Board be sent a copy of the letter.

SSAB Recommendations Status

Kay stated there were no recommendations pending. Froede said he gave Tillson's recommendation from March to Larry Lamberth, EPA's RCRA specialist. Froede said the plant had a surprise RCRA inspection recently. The team's report is not final but doesn't expect any surprises.

Project Status Updates

Seaborg explained that the North/South Diversion Ditch PRAP and Scrap Metal EE/CA were going through final documentation approval and would soon be in public comment periods.

Smart asked about the Permeable Treatment Zone (PTZ). Seaborg and Dover explained some of the problems they were having getting the ground to split. Donham asked if the problems would cause the Feasibility Study to be revised. Seaborg said that the technique might not be feasible at the site.

Donham asked where the 6-Phase was in terms of progress. Dover said it was in approximately the 60% design phase.

Presentations

Scrap Metal EE/CA

Raul Castenada, DOE, and Tom Wheeler, Bechtel Jacobs Company, gave a slide presentation on the Scrap Metal EE/CA. A hard copy of the presentation was provided in the handout material. (attached)

Raul said the removal action objectives of this project are to reduce or remove potential risks and hazards, facilitate investigation or possible remediation of soils in burial grounds and to reduce possible sediment contamination.

Questions and comments following the presentation were:

1. Tillson asked for the definition of "trace." Wheeler said there is not a great deal of analytical information and data on the scrap metal, but that low levels of TRU have shown up in sediment. Wheeler said that the level needed for TRU or transuranic waste is 100 curies per gram. He said the contamination is 10,000 times lower than the standard.

2. Tillson asked if the strut jacks had been examined. These are things that NRC has specifically asked to be cleaned up. The C-400 building has been sampled for transuramics. The results showed some transuranic contaminants. The descriptive term trace should be avoided when data is unknown, Tillson said. Seaborg said there is descriptive data on the nickel ingots. Tillson added that there is a lot of scrap metal out there. Parts of the technetium and plutonium recovery systems are out there and one would expect them to have more than trace contamination. Castaneda said that metals would be examined for radioactive contaminants and be put in intermodals to be tested further. This would be handled much like Drum Mountain. Tillson reiterated that the term trace should not be used when we have no idea what is out there.
3. Tillson said that reference was made to burial grounds located under the scrap metal. He asked if there was data or documentation that verifies that statement. Seaborg said that was primarily anecdotal. The same information was said about Drum Mountain. Tillson said if this is the main driver to get things done there should be more evidence than anecdotal. Castaneda said the main driver for this project is to prevent runoff and further contamination.
4. Tillson asked if there is analysis that shows the spread of contamination going through the ditch and whether or not it is dissolved. Wheeler said there is not much data on dissolved or undissolved (contaminants). There is future design for dissolved phase. Froede suggested contacting John Volpe for further data on dissolved phase.
5. Tillson asked if the 65 million dollars included the cost of remediation. Castaneda replied that this is just part of the whole area to be addressed and the 65 million dollars did not include the cost of remediation. This is the first 50 acres and the remainder will be addressed later. Tillson commented that the cost to build should also include the cost to get rid of sedimentation. Seaborg said this is an interim action for the highest contaminated area. Froede said there will be a sedimentation analysis. Tillson commented that this is a 5,000-year-old technology. A skid-mounted platex over all of it would do a more effective job. Wheeler said other options were considered.
6. Puckett, a member of the public, asked if when the sedimentation basin filled with rainwater and overflowed if the PCB's from buildings such as C-337 would be washed down and contaminate the soil. Wheeler said this was located in the northwest corner and sampling would be done periodically and any problems would be addressed as they come up. Seaborg said the chance of overflow was slim. An option would be a larger basin but cost and location become major factors.
7. Puckett questioned the status of the leaks in C-337. Seaborg said he would get back to him regarding that issue.
8. Jones asked if this project takes into consideration all outfalls including USEC's. Castaneda said the remainder of outfall 01 and outfalls 15, 8, 10, and 11 would be considered. He said DOE received the sampling plan from the contractor. Jones requested a copy for review.
9. Lamb asked if the entire 50 acres were inside the fence. Wheeler said it was all located within the fence in the northwest corner.
10. Donham asked if the basin would be lined and if it had the potential to become a groundwater source of contamination. Froede said that had been considered. Froede said the clay would create a liner.
11. Donham asked if it would be monitored. Froede said there are monitoring wells all around the area.

CERCLA Cell Siting Options

Dave Dollins, DOE, gave an overview of the CERCLA Siting Study document. He stated that DOE wants the SSAB to advise them on the potential site of the CERCLA Disposal Cell. A hard copy of the presentation was included in the handout packet. (attached)

Questions and comments were:

1. Would the cylinders have to be moved? Are you aware of the blue clay? How close is the nearest residential well? Dollins said that characterization this summer or late fall will address these questions.
2. Atkinson asked if any outside waste would be accepted. Dollins said no.
3. Donham asked if off site shipments would be considered at the same time as considering sites. Seaborg said life cycle baseline considers shipping off site.
4. Tanner asked which site was the most up gradient. Dollins said site number one in the southwest corner.
5. Hanson, a member of the public, asked what besides the CERCLA Cell and off-site shipments was being considered. Dollins said none at this time.
6. Hanson asked about a building. She expressed the opinion that more options other than a landfill should be considered, such as aboveground facilities. Dollins said that other sites have had success with the CERCLA Cells.
7. Smart said most waste would be chemical. Is treatment a possibility? Dollins said yes, the WAC considers the waste after everything else has been done.
8. Tanner said he thought that site number one was a better choice because it was located up gradient.
9. Ingram asked if Board should consider number three. Seaborg said that was going to be a tough decision. He explained the balance of costs.
10. Waldrop said site number 9 seemed like a good idea to get work done.

Hanson said the amount of money to repair a landfill would be huge.

The Indiana Bat issue was discussed. Fish and Wildlife personnel stated that they didn't believe all the Indiana bat habitat was accurately mapped.

Kay suggested a subcommittee discuss these issues and bring back a suggestion for one site or other alternatives to the Board. Waldrop said he did not think a small group could make that decision.

Kreher, Representative, Fish and Wildlife, offered to take the Board members out to look at different sites. Donham said he is concerned that the environmental impact is based on so many things that it is hard to make a decision from a piece of paper.

Kay said the decision is going to be made with or without the Board's input.

Amick said a field study would answer many questions. He suggested that a site be chosen and move forth on characterization. Froede said study will be done then it might make more sense to ship offsite. Seaborg said maybe more than one site would be checked before a decision was made.

Kay asked how the Board wanted to handle this situation. Kemp suggested coordinating a field trip. May 3 was set for the field trip and Young will make arrangements.

This discussion is to be on May agenda.

North/South Diversion Ditch

This project is at the Proposed Plan stage. The State and EPA have approved the Feasibility Study. When the Proposed Plan is approved the 45-day public comment period will begin.

Tillson said his recommendation was on hold. The consultant committee might hire a consultant to look at this.

Donham asked if the project would include diverting the ditch flow. Said that Ron Lamb had a concern about diverting of the effluent into Big Bayou which flows through private property.

Seaborg said there would be a dam built to stop the flow of the ditch at the security fence.

Board Evaluation

Bradbury and Branch gave a report on their draft Board Evaluation. They felt the Board was showing more team spirit and effort. They asked that comments regarding the report be sent by May 15. They explained that the evaluation was part of the corrective action required by the Investigation Team. They will be surveying the Board in the fall.

Review of Workplan

The CERCLA Disposal Cell discussion was added to May. Waste Disposition EA added to June. Donham said that the ASTDR discussion needed to be added to May.

Halsey said this would be a good time to address forming task forces. They were set up as follows:

Groundwater Operable Unit: Waldrop, Smart, and Courtney. Bodenstein is the DOE contact.

Surface Water Operable Unit: Long, Ingram, Tanner, and Lamb. Dollins is the DOE contact.

Landfills: Atkinson, Kemp, and Tillson. Tidwell as the DOE contact.

Waste Operable Unit: Owens and Tillson. Tidwell as the DOE contact.

Young will coordinate initial task force meetings.

Agenda

It was decided to move the Waste EA to June and add ASTDR as a discussion for May. Kemp said she would still like to see some involvement with PACRO. Seaborg said he would send the Board PACRO's meeting schedule. Young is to draft a letter and send to Donham to sign inviting someone from PACRO to attend Board meetings.

Letter to Abraham

Donham passed out copies of the proposed letter. **Proposal was approved by consensus to have Donham sign the letter.**

Community Concerns Committee

Rhodes said they were still waiting to receive the maps they had requested.

Community Relations Committee

Young will contact the committee to set a meeting to discuss the Board newsletter.

Consultant Committee

The Board discussed whether the task forces could acquire needed consultants when appropriate. This would eliminate the need for a consultant subcommittee.

Finance Committee

Raper expressed approval of the financial report. Halsey explained how money was being distributed.

Bylaws Committee

Halsey went over the proposed changes suggested by the subcommittee. She discussed attendance and terms of membership. Merryman Kemp proposed a roll-off procedure. The changes and suggestions were discussed. Steve Kay suggested that membership could not exceed 10 consecutive years. After this time, a one-year layoff would be required before resuming membership. **Proposal to accept the new revision, replacing all previous issues, was approved by consensus. (shouldn't we attach the new version for the record?)**

Membership Committee

Courtney said the Board should hear by June regarding approval of recommended Board members. She said that June would be the month for annual membership process.

Meeting adjourned.